REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6 and 8 are pending. Claim 1 is independent.

Applicant canceled claims 2, 3, 7 and 9.

The examiner uses Nikolovska and Borsuk to reject claim 1 as having been obvious.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "a signal filter based on an input provided by a user, wherein the input provided by the user is a request for a use of a different font type and/or a use of a different font size and/or a use of a different font style and/or a use of a different background." Nikolovska and Borsuk fail to teach or suggest this claim feature, whether taken separately or in combination.

The examiner admits that Nikolovska fails to teach or suggest this claim feature and argues that the claim feature is shown in Borsuk at col. 4, lines 54-60, reproduced below for the convenience of the examiner:

> **The CPU 40 responds to a portion of a control program stored in the ROM 42 to cause the text files stored in the RAM 44 to be displayed on the LCD screen 8 in an appropriate font size selected in accordance with instructions issued by the user using the numeric keypad 14 and the font size select button 24 in conjunction with the directional scroll arrows 12. [Borsuk, col. 4, lines 54-60]**

No where above, or anywhere in Borsuk, is there disclosed or suggested a request for a use of a different font type and/or a use of a different font size and/or a use of a different font style and/or a use of a different background. For example, applicant could not locate the work "background" in any of Borsuk except in the heading "BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION." The only suggestion anywhere in Borsuk is in regards to "font size."

Accordingly, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Nikolovska and Borsuk.

The examiner uses Nikolovska, Borsuk and Beer to reject claims 3-6 as having been obvious.

Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Nikolovska, Borsuk and Beer, whether taken separately.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "a signal filter based on an input provided by a user, wherein the input provided by the user is a request for a use of a different font type and/or a use of a different font size and/or a use of a different font style and/or a use of a different background." Nikolovska, Borsuk and Beer fail to teach or suggest this quoted claim feature.

Nikolovska and Borsuk were discussed above. Beer teaches, for example, that current visual style determines a background, and not a user specific input selection of background:

> **Referring to the above examples, the preferred embodiment of the invention provides a method by which a visual style's attributes can be determined regardless of the style. The examples show that the state, the user interface type, and the current visual style setting determine the background and other visual style attributes. [Beer, col. 10, lines 57-62]**

This is very different from applicant's claimed invention. Accordingly, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Nikolovska, Borsuk and Beer.

Claims 4-6 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claim 1. Accordingly, claims 4-6 are not rendered obvious by Nikolovska, Borsuk and Beer.

The examiner uses Nikolovska, Borsuk and Kikinis to reject claim 8 as having been obvious.

Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Nikolovska, Borsuk and Kikinis, whether taken separately.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "a signal filter based on an input provided by a user, wherein the input provided by the user is a request for a use of a different font type and/or a use of a different font size and/or a use of a different font style and/or a use of a different background." Nikolovska, Borsuk and Kikinis fail to teach or suggest this quoted claim feature.

Nikolovska and Borsuk were discussed above. Kikinis teaches a web page delivery method and no user input control over a different font type and/or a use of a different font size and/or a use of a different font style and/or a use of a different background:

> In an important aspect of the present invention, expanded upon in more detail below, the WEB information acquired by scanning database 100 is transmitted via satellite in hypertext markup language (HTML) format, including one or more unique tags that convey commands to the set top box to accomplish a number of unique functions.
>
> One such command-bearing tag is acted upon by set top box 121 in a manner such that links may be displayed in the acquired pages displayed on TV 121 (or on any other display monitor), and such a link, when selected, can cause the system to change channels. These links can be any kind of indicia in a display, such as text, one or more icons, a shape, or even a portion of background in the video display. That is, in a specific embodiment, a CPU in the set top box controls a tuner in the set top box to tune to and cause to be displayed a specific channel indicated in the link initiated by the special tag in the HTML transmission of the special pages acquired by the Simulcast scanner. The link may be displayed in a program schedule matrix by text in a specific color, similar to the way hyperlinks are displayed in a WEB page displayed on a display monitor of a PC. A user of such a set top box will have an input apparatus, which may be an infra-red remote controller, which allows the user to point and select in much the same manner that a PC user uses a pointer device. When a user selects such a link in a program schedule, however, the action initiates the CPU addressing the tuner to switch to the channel on which the selected program is broadcast. [Kikinis, col. 4, lines 38-65]

Accordingly, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Nikolovska, Borsuk and Kikinis.

Claim 8 depends upon, and further limits, claim 1. Accordingly, claim 8 is not rendered obvious by Nikolovska, Borsuk and Kikinis.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that

rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 31, 2006

Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Holland & Knight LLP
10 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116
Telephone: (617) 573-5879
Facsimile: (617) 523-6850

3938536_v1